

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FED-  
ERAL CREDIT UNIONS

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 26, 2007*

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize the 40th Anniversary of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU). Founded in my home state of California on April 26, 1967, NAFCU's current member credit unions stretch from coast-to-coast and are more than 1,000 in number. These credit unions in turn represent more than 30 million individual credit union members.

From 1967 until today, NAFCU has been a strong voice in Washington on behalf of Federal credit unions. The NAFCU members in my district tell me that this association does an excellent job providing them with representation, information, education, and assistance to meet the challenges that cooperative financial institutions face in today's economic environment.

It is with this in mind, I rise today to congratulate the National Association of Federal Credit Unions on their 40th Anniversary. I have worked with NAFCU on issues that are important to the credit unions in my congressional district, and I look forward to doing so in the future. Congratulations NAFCU on your 40th Anniversary.

ON PROTECTING AMERICA'S  
WORKERS ACT OF 2007

**HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 26, 2007*

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration Act (OSHA), passed in 1970, promised America's workers safe and healthy workplaces.

However, OSHA has gaps in coverage and approximately 8.6 million State, county and municipal employees are not covered by the law. Public employees have the same health and safety problems as do private-sector workers but have no protection in more than 20 States and the District of Columbia.

In addition, millions of airline and railroad employees, as well as Department of Energy contractors, are inadequately covered.

Another sad reality is that many employees already covered by OSHA are afraid to report health and safety violations for fear of retribution. When an investigation does occur, however, workers and families are often left in the dark about the progress of the investigation, and too often, even when an employer commits multiple violations, penalties are weak and ineffective.

The Protecting America's Workers Act improves upon OSHA in a number of ways: It raises civil penalties on employees and makes felony charges available against employers who commit willful violations. It also expands coverage to include public employees and millions of other workers who are inadequately covered by other laws. In addition, the Act improves upon current whistleblower protections,

specifically giving workers the right to refuse to do hazardous work and protecting against employer retribution. Finally, it requires OSHA to investigate all cases of death and serious injuries and gives workers and families the right to meet with investigators.

Since the passage of OSHA in 1970, much progress has been made. It has been reported that over 349,000 lives have been saved. Nonetheless, too many workers are still dying—5,764 in 2005—and millions of others are injured or become ill by working in unsafe and unhealthy conditions. The provisions of the Protecting America's Workers Act strengthen OSHA so that it can meet its promise to ensure safe and healthy workplaces for all Americans.

INTRODUCTION OF THE COM-  
PREHENSIVE LEARNING ASSES-  
SMENT FOR STUDENTS AND  
SCHOOLS

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 26, 2007*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today I introduced the Comprehensive Learning Assessment for Students and Schools Act or "CLASS Act of 2007." This legislation makes practical and meaningful reforms to the No Child Left Behind Act.

The importance of ensuring that each child in America is given the opportunity to reach his or her full potential cannot be overstated. Having an educated workforce is a matter of economic competitiveness and it is a matter of national security. I voted for the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, in 2001 because it placed much needed focus on accountability and on closing the so-called "achievement gap" in this country by targeting the achievement of low-income and minority students. These remain laudable and important goals.

Since the law was enacted 5 years ago, I have met with students, parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, and others to discuss the real-world effects of this Federal mandate. What I have learned is that there is broad consensus in favor of establishing high standards and accountability, but there is also an emerging consensus that the law has had some unintended consequences.

In 2005, several stakeholders in Colorado's education community, including representatives from the Colorado Association of School Executives, the Colorado Association of School Boards, the Colorado Education Association, and the Colorado Board of Cooperative Educational Services Association, produced a policy paper suggesting meaningful reforms to the NCLB. The policy paper's prescriptions mirror what I have heard first hand from constituents in my district and other Coloradans. My legislation addresses many of these suggested reforms.

First, the way that the Department of Education currently measures Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, does not yield an accurate metric for actual student progress in our Nation's schools. For example, in Colorado in 2004, the Boulder Valley School District met 140 of 142 required performance targets, Littleton Schools met 124 of 128, and Durango met 91 of 94. Yet under the "all or nothing"

rules of NCLB each of these districts were labeled as failing.

The CLASS Act would allow schools to use longitudinal growth to measure student proficiency to calculate AYP more accurately. Longitudinal growth measures a student's progress from previous years as opposed to comparing the scores of one cohort of students one year to an entirely different cohort the following year. By focusing directly on individual students, we can develop a much better understanding of ways to improve the grade-level learning process.

In addition, the CLASS Act would require that multiple measures be used to assess AYP. These would include: the proportion of State report card indicators met, a performance index score, student drop-out rate, and a measure based on individual student achievement gains over time by disaggregated groups. When a school is required to offer transfer choices and supplemental services to a school because that school has failed to meet all of its AYP targets, transfer choice and supplemental services will only be available to students who fall under the one of the subgroups that failed to meet an AYP target. For example, if the students with disabilities subgroup is the only one within a school to not achieve AYP, then only those special education students would be offered transfer options and supplemental services. This common-sense measure allows schools and districts to target resources where they are needed most.

Second, two federal mandates of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) and NCLB are conflicting. Whereas NCLB requires that students progress at similar rates, IDEA expressly states that students with disabilities progress at different rates. NCLB requires that students progress be measured by a "proficient score" on a standardized test; IDEA is based on an Individual Education Program (IEP) team decision with a test score as just one factor. The CLASS act would allow a student's IEP to be taken into consideration when determining the assessment level under which a student would be tested for the purposes of NCLB.

Third, the CLASS Act would acknowledge the fact that becoming fluent in a new language is a complex process that occurs over time. It is unfair and unproductive to require students, while they are learning English, to be tested in both the acquisition of a new language and in the subject content. The CLASS Act would exclude the performance of students with limited English proficiency who have resided in the United States for less than three years, so as to avoid any distortion in measurement resulting from the new arrivals of such students.

NCLB has provided critical tools for parents, teachers, and administrators to understand how children are learning and what schools and families can do to improve education. But in order for accountability assessments to be meaningful, they need to be transparent and fair.

Madam Speaker, the CLASS Act goes a long way toward achieving the goal of transparent and fair assessments of student progress without compromising the critical goal of demanding excellence in our public education system. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.